

M19118



22501815676



1777

Tobacco

of



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2014

<https://archive.org/details/b20424814>

DEATH IN THE PIPE,

OR THE

Great Smoking Question.

BY J. L. MILTON,

MEMBER OF THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF SURGEONS
OF LONDON.

LONDON:

GEORGE PHILIP AND SON, 32, FLEET STREET.

LIVERPOOL: SOUTH CASTLE STREET.

1857.

M19118

WM 272

1857

M 66 *de*

P R E F A C E.

IN the following pages my principal object has been to give a fair analysis of the evidence brought forward on a question so interesting as smoking seems to be. If, however, arguments against either its use or abuse are to work conviction on the public mind, they must neither be tainted with extravagancies which common sense refutes, nor based on invective and mere conviction, which the partizans of either side can use with equal force. Such, I am sorry to say, has been the case with some of the letters on this subject, but more particularly with the pamphlet of Mr. Lizars, which I was induced to read in consequence of the unqualified praise bestowed on it by Mr. Solly and Mr. Walter Tyrrell. I regret that I am obliged to differ so widely in opinion from these gentlemen, especially as I am under deep obligations to Mr. Tyrrell; but I feel bound, in opposition to their verdict, to class this pamphlet amongst the worst productions of the

kind. I leave it to my readers to decide who is right.

Strange as the statement may seem, I hope to make it evident, in the course of these remarks, that notwithstanding the very positive opinions delivered by many writers, but very few well-authenticated facts exist to throw light on the real influence of smoking, albeit the controversy now at least two centuries-and-a-half old.

24, *Castle Street*, March 9, 1857.

Death in the Pipe ;

OR,

THE GREAT SMOKING QUESTION.

“ Sublime tobacco! that from east to west
Cheers the tar’s labours or the Turkman’s rest!”

BYRON.

“ It is a fit companion for mirth or melancholy; it will make one sleep who wants rest; yet will it keep a scholar waking in his study, and a soldier upon his guard. It puts physicians to a non-plus, for it agrees with all ages, sexes, and tempers.”—

EVERARD.

THE letter recently published by Mr. Solly in the “Lancet” on the injurious effects of smoking is likely to lead to much greater results than its author, in his most sanguine moments, could have anticipated. Though it has been condemned as devoid of facts, it is justly admitted to be an interesting and amusing composition, and well calculated to serve the author’s purpose. With a few exceptions, however, most of the writers who have engaged in the controversy have adopted a very different tone. It is quite evident that they have

decided according to individual conviction rather than in conformity with strict reasoning, and have been only too prone to insist, that because the abuse of tobacco has been followed by hurtful results (or in consequence of personal dislike to its odour), its use must necessarily in every instance be injurious.

Foremost among these stands Mr. Lizars, whose gross exaggerations have been so ably exposed in the "British Medical Journal." As my object is simply to arrive at the truth, and to expose error wherever I find it, I trust it will be admitted that if I have treated Mr. Lizars somewhat harshly, I have had ample reasons for doing so. As his "admirable pamphlet" has been so frequently quoted, and seems to be looked upon as a standard authority, I have made it the basis of this essay; but the last edition is such an inextricable maze of prefaces and appendices, and there is in the whole work such an utter absence of arrangement, that the reader must be prepared to find the criticisms I am about to attempt somewhat desultory.

At page 4 we fairly break ground with an extract from the "Dictionnaire des Sciences Medicales," in which the poisonous effects of preparing tobacco, such as asthma, colic, death, &c., are dwelt upon. From whom the author obtained his information is not stated; and general remarks of this kind unfortunately gain currency with more readi-

ness than the refutation. There is, however, good ground for believing that they were based on the observations of MM. Pointe and Ramazzini, which were subsequently shown to be indebted for the greatest part of their horrors to the imagination of the artists.

“Writers on the diseases of artizans,” says Dr. Christison,* “have made many vague statements on the supposed baneful effects of snuff (the most injurious form of tobacco, it was maintained) on the workmen.† It is said they are liable to bronchitis, dysentery, carbuncles, and boils. At a meeting of the Royal Medical Society of Paris, however, before which a memoir to this purport was read, the facts were contradicted by reference to the state of the workmen at the Royal snuff manufactory of Gros-Caillou, where a thousand people are constantly employed without detriment to their health.‡ This subject was afterwards investigated by MM. Parent Duchatelet and D’Arcet, who inquired minutely into the state of the workmen employed at the great tobacco manufactories of France, comprising a population of above four thousand persons; and the results at which they arrived are, that the workmen very easily become habituated to the atmosphere of the manufactory;

* Treatise on Poisons. † Ramazzini, *De morb. opificum*, 535.

‡ *Rev. Med.* 1827, iii. 168.

that they are not particularly subject to special diseases, or to diseases generally; and that they live, on an average, as long as other tradesmen." *

Mr. Thackray † says, "Tobacco manufacturers are exposed to a strong narcotic odour, and in the stoving department to an increase of temperature; yet the men appear healthy. Here, as well as in some other employments, we admire the agency of that conservative principle to which I lately referred. Men breathe an atmosphere strongly impregnated with a poisonous substance, yet become insensible to its influence. *The only ill effect we can find is from the heat of the stoving department, which all men cannot bear.*"

"Snuff-making is more pernicious: the fine dust of the tobacco, *combined with muriate of ammonia and other substances*, produces disorders of the head, air-tubes, and the stomach," exactly in the same way as shoddy-grinders, flock-dressers, &c., who are exposed to much dust, suffer. If the reader will go through Mr. Thackray's excellent work, he will see how thoroughly this gentleman has shown that no reliance can be placed on the statements of Ramazzini, who had no personal knowledge whatever of the subjects he took upon him to

* Ann. d'Hygiène, pub. 1829, i. 169. See also Ed. Med. Journ. vol. 53.

† The Effect of Arts, Trades, and Professions on Health and Longevity.

decide about. In respect to our present subject, I may finally mention, that Mr. Thackray's views are corroborated by the evidence of Dr. Pereira,* and an article in the "Penny Cyclopædia" on this subject.

But even if what Ramazzini and Pointe had stated were correct, the mischief occasioned by tobacco would not amount to a fraction of that caused by numerous other trades which Mr. Lizars not only does not attack, but like all civilized persons, patronizes extensively. There is not an article of dress, luxury, or even necessity, the preparation of which does not affect the health of the toiling artizan. As a single instance, let me allude to the effects of water gilding, and ask Mr. Lizars to solve the following question. As smoking a cigar is to working twelve hours per diem in a tobacco manufactory, so is keeping a looking glass in your room to a day's work at this ruinous employment. If he approves of my finding, he cannot in fairness question the soundness of my advice—instantly to get rid of such a "pernicious" piece of furniture as a mirror. In the same way I hope to be able to prove, that on the ex-professor's own showing, we ought to give up eating and drinking also.

Next we find a quotation from Dr. Darwin, who

* *Materia Medica*, 1840, Part II. p. 870.

suspected that immoderate smoking produces schirrus of the pancreas. It is an open question whether such absurdity as this ought to be met with ridicule or argument; the whole idea is much on a level with the celebrated theory that the moon is made of green cheese, or the tales of Anti-Megatherium. Both are equally crudities which no one is restricted by act of parliament from making, and which no person refutes for the simple reason that he will not take the trouble. We should have more of them were it not that in physics men are generally acquainted at least with the most elementary facts; they know there must be some visible or plausible connection between the cause and effect; but in medicine every person considers himself competent to decide the most recondite questions without any such troublesome preliminaries.

“There can be no doubt,” Mr. Lizars tells us, at page 7, “that had the Turks never indulged in smoking, they would have been as powerful as in the days of the Sultans Othman, Orchan, Amurath the First, and Bajazet.” There can be likewise no doubt that the inhabitants of every country in their vicinity rejoice most devoutly thereat. From the Alps to the Tigris, the influence of Turkey weighed down enterprize and improvement like a gigantic nightmare, and a race of barbarians, who sent ambassadors to the seven towers, roasted cap-

tains of garrisons alive, and carried fire and sword into the fairest parts of Europe and Asia, much in the same way as our newly found lambs, the Chinese, would do,* were much better occupied in smoking. Some writers who had good opportunities of judging, have ventured to ascribe part of the disasters in Asia Minor to the scandalous embezzlements of the pashas: others to the want of a powerful Sultan. Sceptical persons might ask if the fall of Turkey had been more rapid and overwhelming than that of Assyria, Egypt, Rome, and other mighty empires. I know I shall be told that they fell from a similar cause; that luxury had sapped the only foundations on which an empire can stand — valour and patriotism. This is the general explanation, and though I cannot accept it, believing that a race, like man, must, after reaching the prime of life, decay and perish to revive no more, I will not dwell longer on the point.

Next we have an anecdote of the great Napoleon, who never smoked, and having made himself ill, with a single attempt, pronounced the practice only fit for sluggards; having probably forgotten, at the time, that many of Cromwell's ironsides, whom he so much admired, were smokers. As his Majesty so nearly choked himself in his first essay, that he lost his breath, and the smoke,

* See, in confirmation of this idea, Ida Pfeiffer's "Frauenfarht um die Welt."

“which he knew not how to expel, came out by his nose and blinded him,” it is probable that he remained as well informed about the effects of tobacco on the system, as he is said by Bourrienne to have been about the steam engine. His snuffing certainly does not seem to have had any very “pernicious effects” upon his energy. His nephew smokes, as did also the late Czar of Russia, and I presume very few men would have attempted to put their want of decision (which is emphatically said to be an inevitable result of smoking) to the test by attempting an *émeute* in Paris or St. Petersburg.

One word for all, with respect to great men not being smokers, or giving it up from a conviction of its injurious effects. Mr. Solly has also expatiated on this theme, and even gone so far as to tell us that none of the great thinkers and writers smoked. Lord Raglan, he says, gave up smoking when he took the head of the army in the East.* Sir Charles Napier and Admiral Dundas likewise abandoned it so soon as they assumed the command of the Baltic fleets: it is therefore directly assumed that they did so because they were convinced of its injurious effects on the energy, both of the mind and body.

Then why did they ever indulge in it? How did it happen that, according to Mr. Solly’s theory,

* *Lancet*, Feb. 14, 1857.

such an enervating and destructive practice (after having been continued till they had reached an advanced age) had not entirely unfitted them for duties which required a capacity of the highest order? The reason why they gave it up is simple enough: they had not time for it. Men suddenly called upon to fulfil arduous duties, give up smoking, as they give up reading, whist-playing, or billiards. They did simply what any sportsman or traveller—any man of business or member of parliament, is ready to do at a moment's notice. The excitement of influence, power, and patronage; the responsibility of office; the constant change of scene, and active bustling life of a campaign, supply a different, and, for the time, more potent stimulus.

To some censorious people it might appear that the instances adduced by Mr. Solly are not very happy illustrations of the good effects derived from giving up smoking. I trust it is no injustice to the memory of a gallant soldier to recall the fact, that thousands of brave men under Lord Raglan's care perished of cold and dysentery within seven miles of a harbour crowded with supplies. Sir Charles Napier, too, has not been able to convince his countrymen that moral decision is his strong point, and the *Jupiter Tonans* of Printing House Square congratulated his readers, when announcing that Admiral Dundas had been directed to haul

down his flag, When we contrast such miserable work with the singleness of purpose, the heroism, and nerve of the ill-fated General Bem, who enjoyed his pipe, we are apt to grow more sceptical.

Mr. Solly must have surprised some of his readers when he said, "I believe that all our greatest men, I mean intellectually, statesmen, lawyers, warriors, physicians, and surgeons, have either not been smokers, or, *if smokers, have died prematurely.*" Will Mr. Solly adduce some two or three illustrations of the latter part of his views?

The poets are left out of this category, and possibly do not belong to our greatest men; however, Burns, Scott, and Moore; Byron, Shelley, Milton, and Coleridge; Goethe and Schiller smoked. Locke, Hobbes, and Newton among the great thinkers. Bishop Burnet, the author of "two noble histories," smoked to excess,* as did Parr; Charles Lamb and Robert Hall smoked; Sir Robert Peel is said to have smoked when he could find time, which was not often. Louis Philippe was another instance of its pernicious effects, and his familiar spirit, M. Guizot, like Tennyson, still continues to enjoy the fragrant weed.†

The wonder is that such men could smoke at all. Genius is a tender plant; an abnormal growth.

* British Plutarch, vol. V. p. 95-9.

† British Med. Journal, Feb. 28, 1857.

Many of its brightest ornaments, as Byron, Napoleon, Pope, and others, could never digest coarse food; Wren, Pope, Nelson, William the Third, and many others were not likely from constitutional infirmity to bear smoking. It was just as fit they should abstain from it, as that the dyspeptic man should from the juicy steak and foaming pewter.

Next we are told, that "excessive smoking has had no small share in degenerating Spain," albeit the longevity of Spaniards is proverbial,* and that "we are fast drifting into the same degraded condition." To which it may be replied, that every one who has read the history of the revolt of the Netherlands, knows perfectly well that Spain received her first and most mortal blow in the time of Philip the Second, before smoking to any extent, much less excess, was common. Other writers, of that class who seem gifted with the faculty of deciding by intuition subjects which tax the powers of such men as Montesquieu, Gibbon, and Müller, have told us that it was the Inquisition, the gold of the Indies, the wrath of Heaven for the cruelties of the Spaniards, or for the murder of his son by Philip; intermarriage among the Hidalgos, the lords of the sang-bleu, &c. that occasioned this decadence. Not being afflicted myself in this way, I must rest content with the suggestion that some

* *Lancet*, Jan. 17, 1857, p. 78.

philosophic enquirer might examine whether this excessive smoking was not *a consequence rather than a cause* of the general apathy and decay of the Spanish race, who seem undergoing a similar physical change to that witnessed among the inhabitants of the Italian peninsula, now (excepting always Sardinia) fast sinking into hopeless and incurable slavery. Where are those splendid, ferocious soldiers who fought so bravely under Alva, Parma, and Don John of Austria? Where those men of iron who, with such indomitable valour and such wondrous discipline, in so many desperate fights subdued the wild valour of the Latins and Sabines; the Tuscans and the Samnites? Where that unbroken line of mighty generals from Furius Camillus to Cæsar? Where is *imperial* Rome herself, resplendent with the glories of eight hundred years of victory? Fallen like Tyre, Memphis, Babylon, Nineveh, and not from smoking or any other luxury, whatever the author of “ye Counterblaste” may say.

In this page (9), subjects of the most heterogeneous nature are so mixed up together that they resemble the contents of the witches’ cauldron in Macbeth. There is a long diatribe against opium eating, but what connexion it has with smoking we are left to find out. It is not a necessary accompaniment or consequence of it, and as it has never been defended, attacking it, is assailing a phantom.

Mr. Lizars seems to be going through the same process as the immortal knight of La Mancha, when he converted the windmill into a giant before he speared it.

But where is the evidence that opium eating is so prevalent? I have taken the trouble to make inquiries among several retail druggists, and have only been able to hear of two regular customers for opium. Indeed the filthy taste of the drug will prove a most effectual bar to its general introduction, and the horrible practice of opium smoking is a matter for the Emperor of China only to attend to. The authority of the opium eater, who has had almost as hard a time of it as the British Lion, is of course conjured up to terrify us. And here I will just take the liberty of saying that a more stupid, meagre work than these "Confessions," it never was my lot to read; how Mr. de Quincy ever came to be held up as a man of standard genius, or how his work can be called interesting, I never could understand. If I might venture an opinion of my own, I should say it consisted of vapid, common-place tales, about as intelligible as the "Light of other Days," which nothing but Christopher North's patronage and the fact of its being a solitary work of the kind could have preserved from dying a very early death.

There is a still graver charge against it, viz., that any person of intellect feeble enough to be influ-

enced at all by such a piece of "morality," would be as easily led astray as not ; for when the author revels in the description of a pint of "ruby fluid," on a stormy evening among the hills, and seated by the fireside of his well carpeted, Roman cemented room ; while the wind outside was strong enough to lean against, we may doubt if he was not more likely to bind others in the "infernai chain" with which he had been fettered than to show its dangers.

But to revert to our theme. I should despair of giving my readers any idea of the manner in which the most opposite topics are jumbled together in this pamphlet. Commencing from page 11, the writer fairly takes the bit in his teeth and dashes over everything ; the defeat of the Russians from over much raki, the huntsman leaping worse after a dose of jumping powder, which the Iron Duke did not take ! the foxhound, greyhound, race-horse, Franklin, &c., flit across the page like figures in any incoherent dream ; the connexion between these and tobacco smoking is of course so apparent that I need not elucidate it. If Mr. Lizars means to inculcate the advantages of a hardy temperate life, no one denies that he is standing on safe ground ; how many people have done so before him, in somewhat more intelligible language too ! If he means, as I should conclude, that because, when men take food and stimulants at improper times, and in inordinate quantities, they are rendered

unfit for active duties, he ought, on the principle he incessantly advocates, of "throwing away Tobacco for ever," to throw the contents of his cellar and pantry after it. If he objects to these enjoyments on the ground that they are unnecessary luxuries, why does he not give up such hurtful luxuries as sleeping in a bed and living under a roof? Why not resort to a state of primitive simplicity, and abolish, not only the forge and the loom, but also the corn-mill and the wine-press? Why not re-establish those happy times when men lived on the fruits of the earth—when the swains and maidens danced on the flowery mead, while the old reposed under the stately oak and nodding olive; and the young were rocked to sleep by the purling stream, or wakened by the lark and the nightingale? I am afraid the climate of Scotland would not permit him always to realize this glowing picture, and that like Apemantus, who had similar longings, he would have to "eat root."

What Mr. Lizars says of the training of the prize fighters is perfectly correct. They are not allowed to smoke. This subject was, I believe, overlooked by Mr. Walker in his interesting account of this process in the "Original;" but, on application to the Editor of "Bell's Life," who was courteous enough, although on his busy day, to answer my inquiries at once—as well as on com-

municating with some of the heroes of the ring, I found the statement corroborated. If a man in training smokes, it is by stealth.

But, not only is he obliged to give up smoking, but, under certain circumstances, ale also. I have been informed, indeed, that prize fighters are a remarkably temperate, self-denying, generous race of men. Many of them have raised themselves from the most humble situations to wealth, and, though not surrounded by such a halo of romantic interest as the athletæ of Rome and Greece, they would endure comparison with them, both in public and private life. One interesting point does not seem as yet to have been elucidated, and that is, how long the human frame would, in our civilized life, bear this kind of training.

“From the brief statement there given, it is difficult to decide what opinion Dr. Sigmund entertains on the subject; whether he considers *that the tobacco generates the syphilitic ulceration of the lips, tonsils and gums*, or that the cigar is impregnated with the venereal virus through the medium of the manufacturers of it.” From the context, it would seem that Mr. Lizars quite admits the possibility of such an occurrence: he never attempts to call it in question. Incredible as it may seem, the monstrous doctrine that tobacco could *generate* syphilitic ulceration, has actually been put forward by a hospital surgeon

and ex-professor of surgery; and that, too, in a pamphlet highly spoken of by the British press. Nay, it has even passed without a shadow of censure, through the hands of a hospital surgeon in London. What will Ricord, Diday and Egan, say to this? Mr. Friederich Simon, you are one of the most erudite men living in this speciality; you have ranged through a wider orbit than even the learned Astruc; does your reading furnish you with a parallel? That Dr. Sigmund ever put forward such an idea, I most firmly disbelieve; but, as no dates are given by Mr. Lizars, I cannot confute him by reference to the original papers.

At this part of his work, also, Mr. Lizars states that he has been *often* consulted by gentlemen having *marked* syphilitic ulcerated throat, which they could not account for, having had no primary symptoms in the genitals. On interrogating them, "they have admitted lighting a pipe used by another, or having accepted a puff of a friend's cigar." Cleanly gentlemen they must have been, both the infector and infected! Does Mr. Lizars set no bounds to his credulity? Is he not aware that, as an eminent authority in Dublin humourously said, "married men are peculiarly exposed to infection in an innocent manner?" As it has now been demonstrated by the experiments of Ricord, Egan, Acton, &c. that the secretion of secondary sores is not inoculable, these friends

must have contracted their sores by means of a process which I will not pollute this page by naming. And, even admitting this horrible idea, Mr. Lizars must have seen more of these cases than all the writers on syphilis since the days of Hunter. I distinctly assert, that the records of the last sixty years do not contain a dozen authentic cases of such a mode of infection.

This statement is fitly crowned by the preposterous theory that syphilitic infection might be conveyed by the fumes of tobacco smoked by an infected person!! As if any animal principle could survive burning and converting into smoke. Almost every author on the history of syphilis considers it his duty to ridicule, with due decorum, the superstitions of the sixteenth century; when Wolsey, among other counts in his famous indictment, was charged with having incurred the danger of "impestering" the royal ear by whispering into it, he having at that time secondary syphilis. But the ignorance of the physicians, and the virulent form of disease, with the exaggerations then prevalent, offer at least some excuse for a view, which sinks into insignificance beside such a flight as that of Mr. Lizars, or rather his nameless authority.

"A remarkable change," says Mr. Lizars, "occurs to the excessive smoker when he labours under influenza or fever, as he then not only loses all

relish for the cigar or pipe, but even actually loathes them." This, to Mr. Lizars, is a proof that the taste for tobacco depends upon a "morbid condition of the salivary secretion and organ of taste." Seeing that in influenza and fever the patient turns with disgust from the most wholesome food, it must be evident that the taste for this likewise "depends upon a morbid condition of the salivary secretion and organ of taste;" and that it is the bounden duty of every "repentant sinner"—as Mr. Lizars charitably terms those who give up smoking—to abjure eating and drinking.

"It is truly melancholy," says Mr. Lizars, "to witness the great number of the young who smoke now-a-days; it is painful to contemplate how many promising youths *must* be stunted in their growth and enfeebled in their minds before they arrive at manhood." Young gentleman, do you wish to figure among the Guards, or emulate the renown of Pitt and Chatham? *Laudis amore tumes?* Then throw away your cigars, dispose of your meer-schaums to Mr. Inderwick, and present your cutty pipe plus tobacco to the first crossing-sweeper.

It is much more melancholy to think that such assertions have ever been permitted to pass current, as not a shadow of proof can be adduced that smoking stunts the growth. It is comparatively seldom that, at the very earliest, the practice is

begun before the fifteenth year, when the frame has already acquired its impress for life. The causes which arrest or accelerate growth are as yet totally unknown to us, whatever may be said to the contrary by those who profess to be acquainted with the most mysterious processes of nature. Dr. Campbell, with all his industry, collected one solitary case calculated to clear up this mystery—that of McGrath, who was experimented on in such a comfortable way by Berkeley, Bishop of Cloyne. The physical powers of the rising generation have not yet been shown to have degenerated below those of their ancestors; nay, there are good reasons for believing that in strength and endurance they as far surpass them as they certainly do in cleanliness and temperance. Wherever a name is to be gained or danger to be faced, on the breach or on the ocean, in the desert, the prairie, or the pampa, the Englishman is to be found. From him come the hardy backwoodsman; the enduring, daring, lonely traveller; the adventurous emigrant; men who have triumphed over a thousand difficulties, and sought in a pipe for consolation in a thousand dangers.

When the armour was tried on for the Eglinton tournament, it was found that scarcely a suit was large enough for the degenerate wearers, and our Guards would give an equally good account of that in the Tower. No weapons have been preserved

which a modern athlete could not use. The wrestlers of Cumberland and Westmoreland, of Devon and Cornwall; the prize-fighters of the southern and midland counties; the navvies of Lancashire; the Guards, the boatmen of the Cam, the Isis, the Tyne, and the Thames, would beat the men of last century into fits. In every manly exercise—boxing, running, wrestling, boating, riding—Young England need not fear a rival. About nineteen years ago the matter was put to a practical test. A cricket-match was played at Brighton, I believe (Mr. Dowling can set me right, perhaps), between the smokers and smoke-haters: the latter were beaten.

On what proof does this assertion rest, that tobacco-smoking is so frightfully on the increase? The Excise returns, it will be said. Even admitting that this cannot be explained away by the decrease in smuggling, the records of which reveal the history of more than one startling fact of this kind, by the enormous growth of the population, which, far from being exhausted by the addition of ten millions in the space of fifty years, is now augmenting more rapidly than ever,—even setting aside entirely the fact, that smokers now consume fresh and pure tobacco, as they become more accustomed to comfort and wealth, instead of ekeing it out by all sorts of make-shifts—paper soaked in tobacco juice, *et similia*—just as they use more

cloth, calico, leather, &c., than was done in the olden time; how is Mr. Lizars going to dispose of the fact, that the very author he quotes gives a verdict diametrically the reverse. King James gravely tells, that “a whole wood in England would hardly afford trees enough for hanging the dealers in tobacco;” and Dr. Everard* says, “if the planting and traffic of tobacco were now hindered, millions of the nation, in all probability, must perish for want of food, their whole livelihood almost depending upon it.” Among these Dr. Everard includes the greater number of the druggists, innkeepers, all the tobacconists, &c.

Few unprejudiced persons will deny that the view taken by the editor of the “British Medical Journal” is strictly correct. Smoking to excess is in this country almost unknown in middle life. Those who exceed are mostly either the young, who are the least fitted to bear it—their nervous system being much more easily excited or depressed than in mature age—or the old, with whose longevity, so far as *facts* go, it does not seem to interfere.

“There is at the present moment an old woman at Swansea, 108 years old, whose cutty pipe is never out of her mouth; and we have remarked, that of late most old women who have died at a very ad-

* The Wonderful Vertues of Tobacco in a Pipe, 1659.

vanced age, beyond a hundred years, have retained it to the latest moment of their existence.”* In the “Gentleman’s Magazine” for 1832 is related the death of one George Learrey, at Crondal, aged 103, a labouring man, who retained all his faculties to the last, and who had for the last seventy years smoked three pipes a day. Dr. Hynes, in a most temperate and ably-written communication in the “Lancet,”† quotes the case of an old woman who died at 110, having smoked for upwards of ninety years.

Dr. Bucknill, in a most amusing letter,‡ says, “Now if the example of Newton, who was a great smoker, and who died at the age of 85, is an unsatisfactory instance, what will be said to that of Hobbes? The “Great Anarch” did all his vast mental work under a canopy of tobacco smoke. He spent his days at Chatsworth in lounging and country rambles; at night he set to work at his pen and his pipe. When he commenced he had always thirteen well-filled pipes (churchwardens) ranged in a row before him. He smoked and wrote to the last whiff of the thirteenth, and then retired to rest. He died at the premature age of 91! Had Hobbes tried to insure at the “Victoria,” and Mr. Solly having found his fauces “injected and rough, presenting the appearance of a piece of dirty-red

* British Medical Journal, Feb. 28, 1857.

† Feb. 21, 1857.

‡ Lancet, Feb. 28, 1857.

velvet," had rejected the application, the office would certainly have lost a very good life. Hobbes himself was certainly a most provoking instance of a man who ought to have been killed much sooner than he was."

Almost as provoking as the coachman in 'L'Amour Medecin," who both would and did die on a non-critical day, to the great disgust of some illustrious members of the faculty, who took an opportunity of expressing their decided disapproval of such hasty and irregular proceedings. And I am afraid other instances will be adduced before long in support of Dr. Bucknill's views, as it is quite a common thing to see old men who are great smokers.

As to its producing death even in excess, I have only been able to find two cases; they are quoted by Dr. Christison from Gmelin, rather better authority than American newspapers without dates. Two men smoked between them 35 pipes at a sitting, and both died in consequence; a fate from which we feel about as much concern as if they had met their end from drinking as many tumblers of grog.

Dr. Schneider makes or quotes the statement, that out of 20 deaths of men between the ages of 18 and 25, ten originated in the waste of the constitution from smoking. Like Baron Munchausen, Dr. Schneider, "whose practice has extended in America," wisely refrains from giving his data.

Any person who wishes to know how far confusion of ideas can be carried, is recommended to peruse this letter,* as well as that of Mr. J. B. Neil,† who, amongst other flights, deprecates smoking, because “tobacco is used as a lotion for mangy horses and sheep with lice!” and tells us that the Turks use hookahs, by means of which the smoke cools before it reaches the lungs!!” and that tobacco “dries up the stomach.” I sincerely regret that my want of memory prevents me from giving the exact title of a work I read in my boyhood, in which the fall of Egypt is partly attributed to the “tobacco drinking” of the Copts, who swallow the smoke for half an hour, and then, lying down, allow it to stream out till the supply is exhausted.

“Tobacco predisposes to cholera,” p. 20. (How is it that so many women and children fall victims to it?) “Congestion of the brain occurs almost only in those much addicted to smoking, in whom a cigar is never out of the mouth;” (the women and children who fall victims to it being excluded from the category, on the same principle, I suppose, as the ladies are from the paradise of the faithful). “Loss of memory takes place to an extraordinary degree in the Smoker” (as is clearly evidenced in the case of Parr, Newton, Byron, Scott, Hobbes, &c.)

Its effect in producing emasculation (page 23)

* Lancet, Jan. 31, 1857. † Lancet, Jan. 24, 1857.

requires a more close examination, being one of the utmost importance. Having seen a great many patients of this class, and kept an accurate history of at least two hundred cases, I feel no hesitation in saying, that the surgeon who relies on giving up smoking for the cure of either spermatorrhœa or impotence, will find himself miserably deceived. Many of these patients, in whom the disease was quite as severe, never smoked, and the smokers were not more numerous in proportion than among healthy persons. Many of them had contracted spermatorrhœa in boyhood, from bad habits, long before they began smoking: the subsequent impotence being simply the result of the exhaustion which had been neglected, or could not be removed. In others, disease, natural delicacy, and confinement, had been the chief causes. In not a single instance out of some hundreds was emasculation ever traced to excessive smoking; there were not above two or three hard smokers among the number. At my particular request, most of them gave up even moderate smoking, and in a few cases complicated with dyspepsia, to their advantage; in the majority no improvement resulted, and I soon found that a well regulated diet and early rising, were far more potent. Lastly, to my certain knowledge, many of those who continued or resumed their smoking, recovered both from spermatorrhœa and impotence.

This opinion is opposed to that of Mr. Solly, as also to that of Mr. Tyrrell, who has brought forward one of the few reliable facts yet cited in this dispute. But Mr. Tyrrell's patient abused a luxury. He smoked a dozen cigars daily, which must have required about seven or eight hours, thus showing that the exquisite description by Knickerbocker of the way in which the old Dutch burghers divided their day into twelve hours for sleeping, four for eating and drinking, and eight for smoking, was founded on a deep insight into human nature. Mr. Solly's patient, who spent £300. a year on cigars, could not have consumed them himself. Allowing forty minutes for each cigar he would, at the extravagant price of sixpence each, have required twenty-two hours per diem to get through this amount.

That dyspepsia, sallowness, and wasting should arise from abuse, especially carried to such a disgusting extent as in the case of the American gentleman, who "plugged, quiddled," and smoked all at one time, is no argument against the moderate use of tobacco. There is no reason why a man should not take a glass of good wine at his dinner because millions have perished from its abuse. No humane man would deny a glass of good whiskey or beer to the wearied artizan or poor seamstress, because thousands of degraded wretches nightly stupify themselves at the vilest haunts of profligacy with "blue ruin" or "mountain dew."

Why, the most common observation would convince any man that there is not an innocent luxury, even reading, not an article of the seasoning Mr. Lizars uses to his dinner which, if abused, would not very speedily injure his health as effectually as tobacco. If he were to cleanse and repair some half a dozen rooms in the High Street or Grass Market, and convert them into wholesome abodes instead of dens, which like all the dwellings of our poor in large towns are more sordid than the wigwam of the savage, and more foul than the lair of the wolf, he would save more souls and bodies than he will ever do by his crusade against tobacco.

Dr. Waterhouse, Mr. Martin, and other writers, who unhesitatingly attribute so many wan sallow faces and "*hectical* habits" to smoking, forget that they have not given a single fact in proof. They forget that the forcing system of education, the growth of towns, the confinement, and the desperate struggle necessary to rise now-a-days, must and do bring such evils in their wake. I can show them living instances enough among those who have never smoked. A far more efficient remedy than giving up smoking, though boys who smoke ought simply to be reformed by an efficient application of the tree of knowledge, would be, not to work the brains of lads at high pressure, and to make our towns healthy places of residence. Their reasoning will go little way towards convincing a boy

who has mastered the elements of logic. It will be necessary to decide, first, whether tobacco is a stimulant or sedative, or both at the same time, according to Mr. Horace Green, which any of the said boys know to be impossible; whether it agrees best with the over-fed, according to Mr. M'Donald, or the under-fed, according to Mr. Solly. Meanwhile "birch the young gentleman who prefers cavendish to Cicero."

As closely connected with this part of the subject, I may observe that Dr. Pugh has given an alarming account of the state to which the Australian squatter is often reduced by smoking; a too frequent result of his dreary, monotonous, unintellectual existence. A hopeless exile from all society, especially from that of women; from books and amusements; "his morning smoke is commenced while in his bed, his day is passed in a cloud, and the pipe accompanies him when retiring to rest, to be laid aside when over-powering sleep prevents its further use." There is not a word to be said in defence of a man who so grossly abuses an indulgence. In all probability, however, the absence of stimulants, except tea, which he equally abuses, the frightful, awful, maddening loneliness, under the influence of which he rushes to the town (as I should I know), have something to do in aggravating his hypochondria.

In the same way one surgeon complains of his

sufferings from smoking. "Languor, and want of energy," he says, "often compelled me to resort to the pipe before I could perform my professional duties." I wonder how his lady patients liked this, but I don't wonder that he was prostrated by "horrible dyspepsia." Such men are no more fit to be trusted with an indulgence than a drunkard with the key of the cellar. Mr. Curtis, also, in the same number, cites as an instance of the injurious effects of smoking, that it produced paralysis in two men who seldom had the pipe out of their mouths, and one of whom used to intoxicate himself with tobacco smoking alone. Now I do not defend tobacco smoking in any way, even in moderation; I consider it a luxury which in civilized life might very well be dispensed with, and a practice most repulsive to others; but in all this I see no ground for admitting that such statements prove that smoking frequently brings on paralysis.

"What smoker," says one gentleman, "who remembers the effect of his first pipe or cigar—the horrible sickness, the depression, the supervening headache, and dyspepsia—could attempt to deny that tobacco is a poison, or that it exercises a strong and poisonous effect when inhaled?" Who that remembers his first sea-sickness could attempt to deny that the motion of the ship or air of the sea is a poison? Many a lad who from distaste has seldom touched ale or wine, has on going out to

his first dinner party been made seriously ill, by a quantity which most men consider absolutely harmless.

Some of the statements, such as that of Dr. Pidduck, that fleas do not attack the smoker, and leeches applied to him are killed instantly! that of Mr. J. B. Neil, "that consumption is *clearly traceable* to the one cause of smoking, being transmitted from parents to their offspring!" must somewhat have startled the pathologist or physician who chanced to read them. Really, if gentlemen will go on theory-forging at this rate we shall never be able to keep up with the march of science, and the nuisance will have to be put down by Act of Parliament as befell that old boguey—the Maelström.

This was the gentleman who said that "after clergymen are ordained, *permission to smoke is never granted them by their bishops*, unless a very strong case is made out for the indulgence!" As some of the bishops as well as archbishops smoke themselves, they would find it somewhat difficult to refuse the request, which indeed they never do, for the very simple reason that it is never asked. No injunction against it is ever laid on the clergy; the ordination vows make no mention of the subject. A bishop who heard of a poor curate smoking openly or in excess, might if he felt so disposed, remonstrate with him or even suspend his license; but, as in the case of a rector or vicar,

he might receive a pointed hint to confine his attention to more important matters, it is most probable he would not make the essay. It is well known how little power bishops have over their clergy, even when they commit much worse excesses, as was lately exemplified in the case of a facetious yachting parson carnally addicted to hornpipes and punch.

The prophecies which accompany these wailings are most appalling. Yes, we are at last going to sink in the scale of nations, as Holinshed in Queen Elizabeth's time told our forefathers they would do, if they gave way to such luxury as building houses of oak instead of willow ; for John Bull has a tough constitution and seems disposed to give the prophets a great deal of trouble. But the knell of doom can no longer be deferred, no excuses will be admitted, and tobacco has at last prematurely evoked from the womb of time, that awful day with which we have so long been periodically threatened ; and when some filthy English savage with rusty matchlock and ragged cloak, shall guide the wandering Yankee or Tasmanian lord over England's ruined cities and wasted plains, his task will be to point out, not the haven whence her last navy sailed, not the field where for the last time the lion-banner waved over seas of blood, but the spot where her last smoker fell.

“Professor Petit-Radel is said to have died of

cancer of the pylorus consequent upon smoking tobacco." The causes of cancer are quite unknown, and all the evidence yet collected tends to prove the view of its being essentially constitutional. The professor's death was no more consequent upon smoking than upon his drinking wine or coffee.

With startling suddenness we are introduced to an analysis of the real nature of tobacco. "A hundred pounds of the dry tobacco leaf," says Dr. Johnston, quoted by Mr. Lizars, "yield about seven pounds of nicotin. In smoking a hundred grains of tobacco, therefore, say a quarter of an ounce, there *may be* drawn into the mouth two grains or more of the *most subtle of all poisons*." According to a quotation by Mr. F. B. Thomson, from the Comptes Rendus, Dec. 1846, M. Schloesing's analysis gives from 2 to nearly 8 per cent. of nicotin in the dry tobacco. But Dr. Hassall says that, "1000 grains of tobacco yield, according to the kind used, from 3.86 to 11.28 grains of nicotina, an acrid narcotic poison capable of causing death *in doses of a few grains*." Therefore if Dr. Hassall is right, it is not "one of the most subtle of all poisons," and seems to be even inferior to the nicotianin, another active principle, of which about eleven grains are yielded by about six pounds of tobacco leaves. The smoker then, who consumes a quarter of an ounce daily, is sup-

posed to take into his mouth, not two grains of the most subtle poison, but from $\frac{1}{3}$ to $1\frac{1}{5}$ grains of an alkaloid which is poisonous in doses of a few grains.

Three circumstances concur to reduce this estimate to a fraction of these figures. The first is, that *dry* tobacco does not constitute more than two-thirds or half of what the smoker uses; the other is, that even if the nicotin, salamander like, is to be found in the smoke, as Zeise and Melsens tell us, and none is left in the ash, it is to be remembered that the tobacco *consumed*, from which it is extracted, is really only a part of that placed in the pipe. The third; that all the smoke is puffed out again.

The danger from the empyreumatic oil is chimerical, as people take very good care not to swallow or even taste the smallest drop. Equally so is that from inhalation of tobacco smoke into the lungs, which Mr. Solly and Dr. Hassall speak about. Of the utter impossibility of inhaling tobacco smoke, any one so disposed may convince himself; he will not require to make a second attempt.

At page 29 we are regaled with an extract from the Counterblast of King James, which Mr. Lizars quaintly says, “may be *considered* not uninteresting by many, *considering* the character of the royal author.” Considering that the character of the author “His Sowship,” as he was politely called by the “spoiled child of genius,” or “the monarch

who could do wrong," is one of the most contemptible on record, and not redeemed by one ennobling feature, that such a compound of meanness, cowardice, pedantry, and avarice, never filled a throne, the interest must be of rather a peculiar kind.

That the pupil of Buchanan should be able to compose a piece of writing without grammatical mistakes is not very extraordinary; that the composition of a protestant monarch should find favour among men who still trembled at the name of popery, and its conversions by the wholesome means of torture and faggot, axe and halter, is equally intelligible. But that such a work should have been quoted by a surgeon from the very metropolis of that land which has produced so many illustrious men: Knox, and Hunter; Baillie, Brown, and Cullen; Liston, Fergusson and Syme; the Munros and Bells, is perfectly astounding. *Troja fuit!*

The "most high and mightie Prince James" says, "it is a custom loathsome to the eye," which it is not, for the attitude of the smoker has been often chosen by artists; that "the *black* stinking fume thereof" resembles the "horrible Stygian smoke" (in his *Misocapnus* the royal author improves upon this passage by calling it the "Horrid Steams of Hell"); now the smoke is not black but a delicate grey. Finally, in a disputation at Oxford, he

cites instances of persons whose lungs from smoking were found black and scorched, just as if they had been indurated in smoke ! *

This is very much on a par with his display of theology at Hampton Court, which made many of his attendants doubt whether his majesty was in possession of his senses. It recalls vividly to those who have read it, the account by Hoffman of certain snuff-takers, who had, by poetical justice, been put to death for some lesser crime, “the patera of whose brain was black with snuff !”

At page 30 we have an affecting account of the dreadful condition the Americans have been reduced to by smoking. The researches of Mr. Lizars’ great countryman, Dr. Knox, have offered a more satisfactory solution of the sallow face and the thin frame of the restless Columbian ;—and I advise the reader to peruse his sublime work † before crediting the views of an author who quietly ignores one of the most important points of all—“the immoderate amount of drinks consumed by the Yankee from youth upwards, at

* A Treatise on Tobacco by Simon Pauli, translated by Dr. James, 1776, p. 20. The reader who wishes to know the opinions of Neander, Zacutus, Menardus, Ægidius Ereratus, and Garcias ab-Orta on this topic, should consult this work. He will see how *Ethiopians*, carried prisoners to West India, were very properly chastised by their masters for smoking ! There are also some choice morceaux of this kind in Mr. Thackray’s work.

† “The Races of Man ; a Fragment.” And what a fragment !

all hours of the day smoking and drinking to excess."

Dr. Hassall has pointed out, in the way one might expect from so careful an observer, that the moderate use of smoking may be beneficial to the sanguine and plethoric, as also to persons nervous and irritable from over excitement of business, and that it is equally hurtful to those of weak circulation. Mr. Thackray's views seem to me so germane to this point, that I subjoin them at full length:—

"We are often asked if the use of tobacco is injurious? Viewing the question in the abstract, we should answer, Yes. To a person in full health nothing is required but pure air, food and drink; every thing else is superfluous, and consequently oppressive to the constitution. A narcotic substance must be more than oppressive, because it makes a direct attack on the nervous system. It affects the stomach and the brain. (I have previously shown that the belief of its *great* narcotic power, then prevalent, was refuted by more modern researches). But, viewing man as the creature of civilization, subjected hourly to excitement foreign to his nature, and injurious to his health, narcotics, by allaying nervous excitability, may, in certain circumstances, be really useful. We would not, therefore, deprive the smoker of his consolation; but we would keep the practice

from excess. We would guard especially against that unnecessary potation to which the practice so frequently leads. Drinking is a great and positive evil; smoking is at least but a slight good. If the two must be associated, banish them as decidedly inimical to health and reason. *Smoking can never be proper before the middle period of life."*

Dr. Hassall's researches concerning the adulteration of snuff with lead, have revealed a frightful state of matters; and, though I have no sympathy for any man enslaved by this filthy habit, I trust the inquiry will be followed up. Tobacco seems to be treated even worse. Dr. Gallaghan, R.N., says, a pound of the pure dried leaf is equal to a pound and a-half or two pounds of the tobacco used on shore. Nice stuff the land-lubbers must consume! Of old, the adulterator (for these vermin always seem to have plagued the earth) was cunning in increasing his profits on this herb by dint of euphorbium, vinegar, wine, and lemons: these were not so bad; and the modern smoker, who is dosed with copperas, salt of tartar, saltpetre and sand, must sigh for the good old times. The Londoners smoke the very worst cigars and tobacco in the world, but, like the Indian who enjoys the "foetid variety," they seem very well satisfied.

"The great Wesley, I believe," says Mr. Lizars,

“first suggested the rule which still obtains, that no minister connected with the Wesleyan body should use snuff or tobacco, unless prescribed by a physician.” The idea was not peculiar to John Wesley.

When the Puritan Fathers of Massachusetts first established themselves on the soil of America, they founded a tyranny unexampled in history.* So considerate were they for the morals of those committed to their care, that a house of correction was built in Boston, before even the first church was finished; and near every church a whipping-post was placed. A man who drank wine with his friend was fined; the captain of a ship, after a long voyage, rejoined his wife on a Sunday—he kissed her, and was well flogged for Sabbath-breaking. A man was severely punished for shooting a bear on a Sunday, though the brute was laying waste his field. They fined for keeping Christmas. “A stranger,” says the historian, “had scarcely entered the tap-room before he saw himself followed by an official, who remarked accurately how much he ate and drank, and when it was, in his estimation, too much, forbade the landlord to give him more.” A pleasant country to live in!

These amiable people immediately tried to put down smoking, especially in the case of clergymen;

* Talvi's History of the Colonization of America.

not for its injurious effects upon the health, but because they regarded it as a kind of intoxication ; a vanity, like long hair and sumptuous apparel. Some of the stronger minded wished to hang for every offence of the kind, considering all violations of the word of Jehovah, as they interpreted it, as sins to be cured only by the simple and uniform process of cutting off the transgressor. But, notwithstanding this energetic treatment, the disease of smoking still kept its ground ; though it was first only allowed in uninhabited places, and then entirely prohibited. Yet they kept the practice in check, and in this, as in many other matters, Boston still bears the imprint of their fanatical and undaunted ferocity. Mr. Palliser tells us, that it is still the law to fine in Boston for smoking in the streets.

The petty despots of Germany, who, before the revolution of 1848, had so effectually dragooned their subjects that no resistance was made to the most absurd caprices, such as cutting off men's beards in the streets, putting down dressing gowns and slippers by edict, &c., also took it into their heads to stop smoking in the streets ; and to tell the truth, if it could be stopped in our streets, steamers, omnibuses, &c., there are a good many people in England who would make the same attempt. I for one should ; but I am sorry to say no government seems to have energy enough to prevent men

practising this and other nuisances, such as street music and street cries.

Of course in this controversy the Germans come in for their share of abuse, being considered next to the Americans the true type of smokers. Though I resided a long time in Germany, and formed a numerous circle of acquaintances there, I can safely say, that I never met with an inveterate smoker. I have, however, heard of some, and have seen many persons who smoked early in the morning, and thus perhaps drew upon themselves the suspicion of being at it all day long. With scarcely an exception, they limited themselves at the utmost to four or five pipes or cigars per diem. The German loves to enjoy himself; his pipe after each meal is a luxury which he will take systematically. But, as, in his eating and drinking, he is extremely moderate. In Hanover, their frugality quite surprises a stranger. Most of the gentlemen I knew, rarely touched more than a glass of ale perhaps once or twice a week, except when in society, and then three or four glasses of light wine formed the extent of their indulgence.

I have heard that in Göttingen, Bonn, and Heidelberg, many of the students smoke to excess, but it is for the most part only in their early days. And to his praise be it said, the German is for the most part a pattern of cleanliness in his smoking. The filthy spittoon is never seen; he

uses the finest tobacco; his pipe is the cleanest and least offensive article of the kind; and if he consumes a great deal of tobacco, it is in part owing to his habit of throwing away at once every specimen of it which does not suit his taste.

In enduring fatigue, the German is far below the Englishman, and so far as I was able to compare them, the Frenchman also. Having early imbibed the idea that this was owing to smoking, I was surprised to find on enquiry, that it was equally the case with those who never smoked, and whose parents had been just as free from this habit. Whether any part of it be due to the exhausting process of tuition, which, commencing at an early period of life, rapidly converts every child into a hot-house plant, and while exciting the brain to a most dangerous state of activity, impairs the powers of the frame by the baneful inaction in which it keeps them, I leave for others to decide. It is enough that the fact exists, and that a German could not undergo the fatigue which an English gentleman would look upon as relaxation from the toil of the counting house or study. On a foot tour, a student thinks four or five miles a day* good work; and an artizan seldom exceeds the stipulated four miles per diem: it is not every day he walks so much.

My German friends evidently thought I was

* A German mile is the fifteenth part of a degree.

drawing the long bow when I told them we made light in England of thirty miles a day, and that there were thousands of men who would walk much further and not consider they had done any great feat. On one occasion I took a ramble on foot and travelled twenty-two miles (English) with two friends; one of them was the greatest smoker I ever knew in Germany; the other had never smoked, nor had his father, nor any immediate member of his family. He was a fine stout young fellow, little short of six feet high, with a colour like a peony. His friend was as tall, strongly, but sparsely built; he had been a forester, and a more healthy occupation could scarcely be found; but the journey showed that he would never have stood a hard day with the hounds. The day was fine and frosty, but by the time my friends had accomplished sixteen miles they complained of fatigue; at the end of the twentieth mile the non-smoker was quite knocked up, and long before he had got through the twenty-first he reeled from weakness. Finding him utterly unable to go further, I was obliged to leave him half fainting by the roadside, and go on to Hanover for a conveyance. The other contrived to get home, and had scarcely thrown off the effects at the end of a week.

On another occasion, when walking between Halle and Magdeburgh, I was joined by a traveller, a farmer, who asked leave to accompany me; this

was at half-past nine in the morning. By half-past twelve my companion was obliged to rest, and at five p.m. he fairly broke down, having got through little more than twenty-two English miles. I left him in bed next morning, too tired to rise. I was asked if the greater endurance of the English depended upon the amount of animal food they consume, of which a German does not in general allow himself more in a week than we eat every day. To this I confessed myself unable to give an answer. I put it partly to the test, however, by travelling for a week on the low diet of the German artizan, viz. about two ounces of meat, for the most part dried, a little broth, coarse bread, and a cup of coffee. I could not support it longer, and was some time in recovering from the effects of the experiment. I was once present with an old French soldier when a fine German regiment was exercising. "They are splendid fellows to look at, Monsieur," he said, "but these men would fall like flies on a march."

And here we may, perhaps, most fittingly examine the statement that the French have deteriorated so much under the pernicious influence of smoking; the reader being requested to forget that France was, perhaps, never more formidable, or her army in a finer state than at present. According to a paper in the "Medical Circular," we learn, that while the population of France only

increased about a quarter of a million in the last five years, the increase in the same space of time fifteen years previous was nearly a million and a quarter. "The difference is enormous, and puzzles their savants." The 'Paris Medical Gazette' states, that out of 3,295,000 *young* men examined for military service, 13,007 were exempted for near-sightedness, (how does this arise from smoking?) According to a statistical work lately published on the consumption of tobacco in Paris, the quantity consumed in smoking in 1854 was nearly double that of 1839, and that of cigars five times as much.

This is not the first time that the extraordinary fluctuations in the French population have puzzled the savants. Voltaire was as much at a loss to decide upon the point as his readers will be. Whether the present phenomenon is in any degree attributable to the numbers of fathers killed, exiled, and ruined during the sanguinary struggles of 1848 and the memorable 2nd of December, we can only conjecture. The increase in smoking is enormous; but how "it demonstrates the same injurious effects on the French as is witnessed in Germany," is difficult to understand. These injurious effects, if they really exist, could be easily shown. Why, then, are they not pointed out and distinctly traced to smoking? Because they

exist at the same time, it does not prove that the one results from the other.

Mr. Lizars has evidently found out that every disease under the sun is caused by tobacco. "Disease of the liver," he says, "seemed to be caused by the tobacco exciting the system." How do women get it? *Dr.* Scott's foot-bath is recommended as a remedy. Was this the *Mr.* H. Scott who introduced the use of nitro-muriatic acid?

At page 31 we stumble upon another discovery—that by *Dr.* Adam Clarke, a Methodist divine, who wrote on the pernicious practice of smoking. It is often said, that when a man finds himself unable to get a living in any other way, he sets up as doctor; and if professional men admit them to their own level, we can hardly wonder at their doing so; but I must confess my astonishment at finding such an authority quoted by *Dr.* Hassall. If this "eminent Methodist divine" knew no more of theology than he did of our present subject, he must have edified his congregation; for he quotes Sylvester, who derives the name from Bacchus;* whereas it took this name from Tobacco, a district in New Spain, about "forty-foure miles above

* Tobacco, as *Τω Βακχω*, one would say;
To cup god Bacchus, dedicated aye (! ! !)

Any person who wishes to be cured of a weakness for poetry, will find an immediate antidote in Sylvester's chaste lines.

Mexico,"* which again owed its name to a word, used in the Carribee language, for the pipes in which it was smoked.

The next *dramatis persona* is Count D'Orsay, who was a victim to the immoderate use of cigars, and whose "death made a profound impression on the Emperor"—not profound enough to make him give up his cigar. Then we have the case of a gentleman who had become the inmate of a lunatic asylum, because "he blazed away at a fearful rate." As this case supports Mr. Solly's views, I will pause so far as to oppose to it the evidence of a gentleman rather better able to judge than Mr. Lizars, viz., Dr. Bucknill, of the Devon County Asylum,† who, with a stern array of facts and figures, scatters these views to the winds. In twenty thousand cases of insanity he found only one referred to smoking, and he corroborates this statement by the authority of Dr. Conolly, a host in himself. Finally, he tells us, "the preponderance of lunatics of the female sex is conclusive evidence against the theory that tobacco either causes or predisposes to mental disease"—a view confirmed by the evidence of Dr. Ranking and Mr. Watson in the same number.

Then comes Mr. Fenn, who has seen tobacco destroy "all the chances of recovery in otherwise favourable or merely doubtful cases of typhoid" (*sic*). I suppose this means typhoid fever. How

* Everard.

† Lancet, Feb. 28, 1857.

did the smoking prove fatal? Did Mr. Fenn's patients smoke while suffering under typhus?

And now I must beg the reader's most particular attention, as the section about to follow contains statements and views which I might possibly be thought slanderous in calling by their right name. Mr. Lizars, impressed with the view that smoking brings on cancer, first clearly attributes all cases of cancer of the lip to smoking—an inquiry somewhat opposed to the results of the entries of cases of this disease at St. Bartholomew's Hospital, which do not give more than a fifth of regular smokers and a majority of non-smokers; and next brings forward, 1st, the case of Mr. A, who, being informed that his disease would kill him, at once "threw away Tobacco for ever." "From this time the disease got progressively worse;" and his tongue "*mouldered* away." 2nd. At the end of this case, p. 36, is the following unique sentence:—

"Query—If the ulceration (what ulceration?) differs from carcinoma, a smoker runs (query, does a smoker run?) the risk of two diseases, viz., carcinomatous sarcoma (!) and (hear it, Messrs. Paget, Walshe, and Rokitansky!) carcinomatous *nicotianum* (!!).

3rd. Mr. Lizars absolutely goes so far as to say, "that a person with cancerous diathesis, or *pre-disposition or constitution* (*sic*), smoking a cutty pipe, must be liable to communicate the disease to

another who might take up the same pipe" (!)—statements I leave my readers to reflect upon.

Last act of all Mr. Lizars adduces the evidence of Mr. Anton, who is convinced "that a soldier who is an inveterate smoker is incapable *to level* his musket with precision, and *without shaking his hand*, so as (to) take a steady aim;" and of Mr. O'Flaherty, "that extraordinary intelligent soldier." "He also says that he has known men who, previous to their using tobacco, were the finest marksmen, and could send a bullet through the target at 800 yards' distance; but who, after they had commenced to smoke and chew tobacco, became so nervous, that they could scarcely send a bullet into a haystack at 100 yards' distance.

I can go no further, and I should think my readers must be quite as tired as myself. The task of analyzing such reasoning and credulity becomes at last intolerable. It may be thought that I have purposely sought out every weak point in Mr. Lizar's pamphlet, and omitted all that is valuable; that I have sifted the corn from the chaff, and only displayed the latter. He who is of this opinion has now the opportunity of wreaking poetical justice. Let him read both pamphlets, and, if he thinks fit, award me the chaff as a fitting recompense.

FINIS.



Just Published, with **SUPPLEMENT** containing in all 113 Plates, Coloured after Nature, with Descriptive Letterpress same size as Plates, Demy Folio, Half Bound Russia, Gilt Top, Price £5, 5s.

A New and Improved Edition of

LIZARS' ANATOMICAL PLATES

WITH

SUPPLEMENT.

BY JOHN LIZARS, F.R.S.E.

LATE PROFESSOR OF SURGERY TO THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF SURGEONS,
AND LATELY SENIOR OPERATING SURGEON TO THE
ROYAL INFIRMARY, EDINBURGH.

THE SUPPLEMENT

Contains 10 PLATES, illustrating the Minute ANATOMY of the NERVES of the HEAD and HAND, the ANATOMY of the FEMALE BREAST, the ANATOMY of the MALE TESTIS, the ANATOMY of the MALE PERINEUM and PELVIS, and may be had separately, Price £1, 1s.

"These Plates are by far the best of the kind that we have seen"—*Lancet*.

"This is a splendid and uncommonly cheap work."—*Medical Repository*.

"An excellent System of Anatomical Plates."—*Westminster Review*.

"The plates and the details are accurate."—*Medical Times and Gazette*.

"In addition to the other Plates, we have several new and instructive views of the male perineum and pelvis, bearing particularly on the diseases and injuries incidental to this part, conveying the most valuable information; and here we may assert our opinion, that no living surgeon is more competent than Lizars to afford practical instruction relative to the operative surgery of this region. We would say, the task has been well done, and the work should be in the hands of every student and teacher in surgery. The latter part of the 'Supplement' is peculiarly interesting, as bearing upon points of surgery by which Mr. Lizars has greatly raised his fame; and the accuracy of the information here set forth may be best judged of, by a short extract from the preface—thus, Mr. Lizars writes—'My own attention for a considerable period has been engaged in investigating the diseased state of the urethra and perineum, connected with, and dependent upon, stricture of the urethra. My friend, Mr. A. M. Edwards, has made very masterly dissections, exhibiting the normal condition of these parts; and I have to tender my best acknowledgments to Professor Goodsir for his liberal assistance in enabling me to produce such representations.'"—*Dublin Quarterly Journal of Medical Science*.

"These 'masterly dissections' constitute the chief value of this Supplement of Ten Plates, because they are original and instructive, and reflect great credit on Mr. Edwards and Professor Lizars. The original plates must have greatly assisted to uphold the reputation of the Edinburgh School of Medicine."—*North Briton*.

"All the newest discoveries are introduced, and the plates are so beautifully and truthfully executed, that they seem to rival the Italian preparations in wax, and prove fit to supply the want of the cadaver itself."—*Edinburgh Advertiser*.

"Wherever British, French, or American anatomists and surgeons are to be found, this work is well known and highly appreciated. No fewer than 2800 copies of the first edition have been disposed of, the price of each being then £12, 12s. We most heartily wish it a rapid sale."—*Edinburgh Evening Post and Scottish Record*.

"The new engravings amply sustain the very high professional character of the original work, whether as to minute and accurate delineation, faithful representation, or artistic execution. The ten new engravings which the Supplement contains, illustrate the latest discoveries made in the anatomical structure of some of the most important organs of the human body, with a practical bearing in reference to operative surgery. We can safely and strongly recommend the work to the careful perusal of the medical student and young practitioner."—*Daily Scotsman*.

By the same Author,

Practical Observations on the Use and

ABUSE OF TOBACCO, SIXTH EDITION, greatly enlarged, with Extracts from King James' Counterblast, The Great Napoleon's First Lesson on Smoking, and the Works of Darwin, Prout, Pereira, Orfila, Cleland, Johnston, Brodie, Solly, Henderson, Mc'Cosh, and the Dictionaire des Sciences Medicales. Demy 8vo. Illustrated with Coloured Plates. The Drawings after Nature. Price 1s.

In an able and conclusive letter of Mr. Solly, of St. Thomas' Hospital, London, in the *Lancet* of 7th Feb. 1857—headed "Tobacco Controversy—Is Smoking Injurious?" there occurs the following statement—"I cannot conclude this epistle without acknowledging the valuable observations on it"—the Abuse of Tobacco—"by Mr. Lizars, whose admirable pamphlet should be read by all smokers and young men thinking of it."—*Lancet*.

"Mr. Lizars has said enough in this pamphlet to frighten cigar smokers out of their propriety, if not out of their cigar. King Jamie's Counterblast was a mere whiff to the cloud of testimony which Mr. Lizars has blown against Tobacco. . . . Snuffing, smoking, and chewing, are bad habits; and we advise any gentleman who is hopelessly abandoned to either to read the pamphlet, and should he still persist in the practice and get syphilis, have an attack of cholera, or become emasculated, he will deserve the affliction."—*Medical Circular*.

Practical Observations on the Treatment

OF CLUBFOOT, THIRD EDITION, with Additional Cases and Plates; together with an APPENDIX. Demy 8vo, Price 1s.

"The successful results of Mr. Syme's treatment of Clubfoot in dispensing with mechanical aid, have been ably shown in the practical illustrations of Mr. Lizars. The correct interpretation of *subsequent care* is here exhibited in Plate V. of Mr. Lizars' 'Practical Observations on the Treatment of Clubfoot,' in which the unsuccessful case 'of Master J. B., after having been three times operated upon by Mr. Syme, and only the boot Fig. 2 (a simple laced boot) put on' is represented; and a complete cure of the same case by Mr. Lizars' treatment is also figured."—*Extract from Lancet, November 17, 1855*.

Practical Observations on the Treatment

OF STRICTURE OF THE URETHRA AND FISTULA IN PERINEO, THIRD EDITION, Illustrated with additional Cases and new Drawings of these Affections; with a copious APPENDIX, containing the Opinions of the most eminent London Surgeons and others, on the Perineal Section, showing that the operation has proved fatal in Edinburgh and London. Demy 8vo. Price 5s.

"I have witnessed," says he, "this perineal section performed several times, in the most able manner, but the patients have all died."—*Opinion of Mr. ACTON on the Perineal Section—See Diseases of the Urinary and Generative Organs, 2nd Edition, 1851, page 160*.

"We consider what is called Mr. Syme's operation for the cure of Stricture to be the greatest opprobrium of surgery of the present day. Any surgeon who destroys the life of a patient by the performance of that operation, ought, in our opinion, to be indicted for manslaughter."—*Opinion of the EDITOR of the Lancet on the Perineal Section, in Lancet of 3rd September 1853*.

"The Third Edition of a work already well known to the Profession, in which the method of treatment by Perineal Section has been made the chief matter for discussion. . . . The statements of Mr. Lizars serve to corroborate the opinion which generally prevails, that the Perineal Section, in cases of *permeable* stricture, is an unsafe proceeding—one which does not promise to be effectual, and therefore unjustifiable."—*Extract from Medical Times and Gazette of 7th January 1854*.

"I believe, that the cutting operation for stricture, even when performed by the most skilful operators, is a dangerous proceeding. I believe, that when the records of such cases are given to the public, we shall be grieved with its fatality."—*Opinion of Mr. SOLLY, Surgeon to St. Thomas' Hospital, London, on the Perineal Section, see Lancet, 26th April 1856*.



F/7
364/64





